

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 17, 2007. Claims 1-30 were pending, and under consideration in the application, and claims 31-41 were withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner rejected all claims under consideration under 35 U.S.C. §101. With this amendment, claims 1-5 and 24 have been amended, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

At the top of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite and because they are purportedly directed to a single means. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. With this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to specifically state that the set of classes being claimed comprises "a first subset of classes configured to include context information, selectable by a client, and representative of a selected natural language processing (NLP) analysis set... and the set of classes further comprising a second subset of classes configured to receive the natural language input and provide analysis results for the selected NLP analysis set represented by the first subset of classes." It is thus clear that the claim is directed to more than a single means. In fact, the claim is directed to at least two functional class subsets, that are configured to perform specified functions, wherein the function performed by the second subset of classes is dependent on information input through the first subset of classes. Therefore, it is clear that claim 1 is not directed to a single means, but instead is directed to an object model having a plurality of different subsets of classes, each configured to perform functions, wherein they are functionally related to one another as claimed. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner indicated that "for the claimed process to be statutory, the claim (claim 1) must...: be limited to a practical application." Applicant submits that the claim, as amended, is clearly limited to a practical application. The preamble of the claims states that the object model is "for supporting an

application programming interface to a natural language processing system that performs natural language processing on a natural language input...”. It is thus clear that even the preamble specifically directs the claim to a practical application - that being supporting an API in a natural language processing system that performs natural language processing on an input.

Further, the individual elements of claim 1 also specifically direct the claim to a practical application. The first element is a subset of classes that allows a client to select context information indicative of selected natural language processing analyses to be performed on a given natural language input. Specifically, the first element of claim 1 includes “a first subset of classes configured to include context information, selectable by a client, and representative of a selected natural language processing (NLP) analysis set...”. The NLP analysis set is, of course, defined in claim 1 as one or more NLP analyses, selected by the client to be performed on the natural language processing input by the NLP engines. Thus, it is clear that the first element of claim 1 has practical application, in that it allows a user to select NLP analyses to be performed on a natural language input.

The second element of claim 1 is also direct to a practical application - that being to receive that natural language input to be processed and to provide analysis results for the selected NLP analysis set (which, again, are selected NLP analyses to be performed on the input text). Specifically, the second element of claim 1 includes “a second subset of classes configured to receive the natural language input and provide analysis results for the selected NLP analysis set represented by the first subset of classes.” Thus, it is clear that the claim, as amended, is directed to a practical application. Therefore, as indicated by the Examiner, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that claims 1-30 are allowable, and in proper form. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-30.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Joseph R. Kelly/  
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg